14 Charles Lane
New York, N.Y. 10014
July 13, 1976

To the Coordinators of the Leninist Trotskyist Faction

Dear Comrades,

Enclosed are the following items:

1. Report on the May 22-23, 1976 meeting of the United Secretariat by Comrade Johnson, and attachments.

2. Correspondence between Comrades Gus and Mikado.

Comradely,

Caroline Lund

Report on May 22-23, 1976 United Secretariat Meeting

by Johnson

The general tenor of United Secretariat meetings continues to get worse. Important political discussions are postponed or placed at the end of the agenda. A series of Organizational motions are passed at the end of the agenda without time for adequate consideration. In order to fill up the agenda time reports are placed on the agenda that have no other purpose. This was especially true at the May meeting with the report on India. It was a one-hour report on the background of the political situation leading up to the state of emergency last year. While we were having this discussion, the Indian section was holding its convention. No one at the meeting had read any of the documents of the Indian comrades, nor were they aware of what the Indian comrades planned for the convention. Yet the IMT comrades wanted to pass a motion that tends to condemn the Indian section.

Comrade Kailas Chandra, a member of the International Executive Committee, is editor of a magazine that has editorially given support to Ghandi. This problem was to be discussed at the Indian convention and the subsequent central committee meeting. The IMT motion stated that the Secretariat was going to adopt a statement at its next meeting and write to the Indian section and Chandra informing them of this and asking if they had anything to say. We said that we should write the Indian section to see how they were handling the situation and consult with them on any further secretariat action. The motions are attached (see Attachment I). Moreover this step was taken by the IMT without the Secretariat having once written to the Indian section on this matter. Several IMT comrades stated they had written to Chandra but received no reply. Finally, this whole matter was not raised by the IMT during the report but in the course of the discussion following the report.

A similar thing happened during the report on Portugal. The bulk of the report was a journalistic account of what each of the parties was doing in the presidential elections. In the final few minutes there was an attack on the comrades who had been expelled from the PRT who sympathize with the LTF positions on Portugal. The Portuguese comrades were attacked for forming a "third" group. The IMT motion instructs these comrades to join the "fusion process" going on between the LCI and PRT, otherwise they will be outside the International. We introduced a motion to recommend to these comrades and the LCI that they mutually explore a principled unification. See Attachments B and C.

As reported from the last Secretariat a split has taken place in the Liga Comunista of Spain. The comrades outside the LC tend to agree with the positions expressed in Revista de America on Spain. The Secretariat had no further information than this. We said that we should attempt to get the information concerning the split. The IMT passed a motion that there be a delegation to Spain to prevent the formation of a "third" group. See Attachments D and E.

The report of the IEC commission on Mexico is attached (Attachment A). We requested that the Mexican elections be discussed,

as well as the position of the Liga Socialista (Militant Tendency) of participating in the electoral bloc with the Communist Party, and the positions expressed in an article written by Comrade Ricardo. The IMT postponed this discussion to the end of the agenda so there was no time for serious discussion. The general argument of IMT comrades was that this was a tactical question and Ricardo's article did not represent a departure from our principles. A letter from Joseph Hansen to the United Secretariat and the motions concerning this are attached (see Attachments F, G, and H).

There was a short discussion on the IMT draft of a new European Resolution. It was adopted for publication in the IIDB although there were some amendments at the meeting and the document is not yet ready. Again the question of the European Communist parties was not discussed. This is a further example of discussion on important political questions being continually postponed.

There was a report on the Italian elections and the Italian section's decision to participate in the Proletarian Democracy slate, although it has no program. We expressed reservations about this course and stated we were concerned about what would be the program of this slate. We said we thought it would probably be more correct to call for a vote for the CP or SP. There was also a discussion on getting all of the European sections to campaign for Proletarian Democracy amongst Italian immigrants and to build public meetings with other "far left" groups on the elections. This was not formally voted because the Italian organizations were going to initiate the campaign.

Comrade Domingo gave an informative report on some of his recent travels to South America. We have groups of supporters or organizations in almost every Central American country now. The majority of the report was on Columbia, where two important organizations are moving toward the Fourth International. The Bloque Socialista, the largest centrist organization in Colombia, decided at its recent convention to begin to try to establish relations with the International. It suffered a small split at the convention but those forces also want relations with the International. The other organization, the Comando Camilistas, were a rather large Guevarist organization. They have over the last several years been rejecting the guerilla warfare strategy and reaching Marxist conclusions. They too are interested in the Fourth International. The United Secretariat decided to encourage the two sympathizing organizations in Colombia to work with these new forces.

There was also a brief discussion on the preparations of the pre-world-congress discussion. A parity committee was established to begin to oversee the preparations for the congress. See Attachment J for motion adopted concerning the organization of the IIDB.

******

Attachment A

Report of the Commission established by the February 1976 meeting of the International Executive Committee to observe the implementation of the motion, Concerning Unification of the Mexican Trotskyists, adopted by the February 1976 IEC meeting.

The Commission met in a number of sessions during the week of April 3-10, and again on May 12 and 14, 1976. On these occasions we were able to meet with representatives of the three groups involved.

For the purposes of this report, we will utilize the names that the two groups which claim the continuity of the Liga Socialista use for themselves. The group that had a majority of the votes at the December 1975 convention of the Liga Socialista calls itself the Liga Socialista. The group that had a minority of the votes at that convention calls itself the Liga Socialista (Fracción Bolchevique Leninista).

The representatives of all three groups said that they accepted the IEC motion. But in the course of implementation of this motion a number of problems have appeared.

I. Charges

There are a number of charges that were raised by the representatives of the three groups that the Commission heard. These concerned the following:

1. The article written by Comrade Ricardo and submitted for publication to Intercontinental Press, and published in El Socialista.

During the first series of meetings of the Commission (April 3-10), Comrade Ricardo, representing the Liga Socialista, stated that the failure of Intercontinental Press to publish his article constituted a violation of the IEC motion.

Comrade Josefina, representing the Liga Socialista (Fracción Bolchevique Leninista), charged that the content of Comrade Ricardo's article, which was printed in El Socialista, violated the IEC motion, in that it publicly re-raised the issues of the alleged charge of Comrade Ricardo being a police agent, and that of the alleged theft of materials from the LS headquarters, both closed by the IEC motion. In addition, she charged, the article raised new issues, in violation of the IEC motion.

The Commission unanimously agreed that it had no competence to resolve this matter, and referred it to the editors of Intercontinental Press.

At the Commission meeting of May 12, Comrade Ricardo said that the matter could be resolved by printing his article in the International Internal Discussion Bulletin, which would make it available to members of the Socialist Workers Party. Comrade Riel agreed to

transmit to the United Secretariat Comrade Ricardo's request to print his article in the IIDB.

2. Charges of the use of physical violence.

Comrade Josefina charged that members of the LS had physically attacked members of the LS(FBL) on four occasions, January 23, February 19, February 23, and March 13, 1976. These charges were contained in articles in the press of the LS(FBL) (attached).

Comrade Ricardo denied that the use of physical violence against members of the LS(FBL) was a policy of the LS, and did not accept that members of the LS started such incidents. He stated that on the occasion of the January 23 incident, the LS leadership had decided to stop the members of the LS(FBL) from selling their newspaper on the grounds that the LS(FBL) newspaper was at that time named El Socialista, as was the newspaper of the LS, and this was considered a provocation.

Comrade Ricardo agreed to print a declaration in El Socialista concerning the matter, which was printed in the April 16-30 issue of that paper (attached).

Comrade Roberto, representing the LS(FBL) at the May 12 meeting of the Commission, stated that there had been no further incidents, and expressed satisfaction with the printing of the declaration of the LS, and this closed the matter.

3. The name utilized by the LS(FBL).

Comrade Ricardo charged that the utilization by the LS(FBL) of that name, and the statement on the masthead of Clave that it was "formerly El Socialista," constituted a violation of the IEC motion to the effect that these comrades would not speak in the name of the Liga Socialista.

Comrade Josefina stated that the LS(FBL) did not speak in the name of the Liga Socialista as a whole, but of a public faction of the Liga Socialista, and thus did not violate the IEC motion. She stated that the designation LS(FBL) and the words on the masthead of Clave indicated the political viewpoint of the LS(FBL) that its policies were a continuation of the public policies of the Liga Socialista prior to December 1975.

4. Materials at the headquarters of the Liga Socialista prior to the December 1975 convention.

At the time of the first meeting of the Commission (April 3), no materials had been brought to the LS headquarters. Comrade Josefina said that this was because comrades of the LS(FBL) had been threatened with physical attack if they came to the LS headquarters.

In the presence of the Commission, the comrades of the LS(FBL) brought the organizational files to the headquarters and turned them over to the LS.

Comrade Ricardo stated that this was insufficient since the LS(FBL) had not turned over various office machines and furniture that was in the LS headquarters prior to the December 1975 convention, and charged this violated the IEC motion. Also, Comrade Ricardo stated that the files turned over were incomplete.

Comrade Ricardo said the matter could be reduced to a particular expensive typewriter, which had to be turned over in order for the IEC motion to be carried out.

Comrade Roberto stated that this typewriter was his personal property, and that the other items were the personal property of other members of the LS(FBL), and were therefore exempt by the IEC motion itself.

Comrade Ricardo stated that given the refusal of Comrade Roberto to turn this typewriter over to the LS, the LS would have no discussions or common work with the LS(FBL), since this was a clear violation of the IEC motion. However, he said that the LS is not opposed to the LCI having relations with the LS(FBL), and that the LS does not make unification of the LS with the LCI conditional upon the LCI breaking relations with the LS(FBL).

II. Present situation.

Over the weekend of April 17, the Grupo Comunista Internacionalista (GCI) and the Rojo group held a reunification conference, and formed the Liga Comunista Internacionalista (LCI).

Comrade Manuel, representing first the GCI and then the LCI after the reunification conference, stated that the GCI and LCI stood for a swift unification of the LCI with the LS and the LS(FBL). The LCI founding conference adopted a position on the question which was printed in Bandera Roja (attached).

Comrade Ricardo reported that the Central Committee of the LS unanimously decided at its meeting of April 3 and 4 to begin common work on all levels with the LCI at the end of May, although the LS would continue to publish its own press. After a period of two or three months the LS would hold a congress to decide on the basis of that common work whether or not to unify with the LCI. A At the May 13 meeting of the Political Committee, however, a minority of the PC called for a postponement of the beginning of common work with the LCI until certain pressing organizational problems faced by the LS are solved. A meeting of the Central Committee has been called for May 22 to decide this question.

Comrade Manuel stated that the LCI was agreeable with the position supported by the majority of the LS Political Committee.

Comrade Roberto said that the political differences between the LS(FBL) and the LS and the LCI had deepened. He stated that the LS(FBL) was opposed to the platform signed by the LS with the Mexican Communist Party in support of the CP candidate for president, which among other things characterizes the Communist Party as revolutionary. He stated that the press of the LS had further defended the concept that the CP is a revolutionary organization,

and that in the opinion of the LS(FBL) this represented a dangerous break with Trotskyist principles. Comrade Roberto stated that the electoral position of the LCI, while the LCI did not sign the common platform with the CP and LS, and has put forward its own electoral platform, failed to fight the capitulation of the LS to the Stalinists in this election. He proposed a common discussion bulletin for the three organizations to clarify the depth of the differences on this question, as well as to discuss those questions indicated in the IEC motion.

Comrade Ricardo rejected publishing a common discussion bulletin, on the grounds indicated above, but proposed to have a common bulletin between the LCI and the LS.

Comrades Manuel and Ricardo agreed to establish a common discussion bulletin between their organizations, and Comrades Manuel and Roberto agreed to establish a common discussion bulletin between the LCI and LS(FBL).

At the same time, Comrade Manuel rejected Comrade Roberto's characterization of the differences between the three groups concerning the elections. He stated that they were of a tactical, not a principled, nature.

Both Comrades Manuel and Roberto proposed common work between the LS(FBL) and the LCI on areas of agreement in the period ahead.

* * *

The three members of the Commission, agreeing on the above report of a factual nature, reserve the right to submit their own personal evaluations, on which there was not agreement in the Commission.

s/Greco
s/Stateman
s/Riel

May 14, 1976

COPY COPY COPY

Declaration of the Political Committee of the Liga Socialista

Our leadership has decided that the FBL did not comply with the agreement that it voted for at the last meeting of the IEC, for the following reasons:

a. They did not return the property of the organization, except for part of the archive.

b. They continue speaking in the name of the Liga Socialista. We reject their conception that it is a matter of two public factions of the same organization. In fact, two different organizations exist, with different leaderships, newspapers, activities, and political lines.

For that reason, the argument about public factions is as fantastic as if we, the LS, were to declare ourselves a public faction of the GCI.

Furthermore, we believe that this type of argument and method contributes to discrediting our international movement and making it look ridiculous. Their naming themselves the Bolshevik-Leninist Faction of the Liga Socialista reminds us of the same type of sectarian and ridiculous name taken by the Lambertists when they split: Leninist Trotskyist Faction of the Liga Obrera Marxista.

In addition, we also consider that the leadership of the SWP did not comply with the agreement of the IEC for the following reasons:

a. It continued publishing articles in IP that contained organizational attacks against the LS.

b. It did not publish in IP the article answering Hansen, as was agreed.

In view of the fact that this was not done, we ask that the article be published in the International Internal Bulletin.

For the above reasons, we state that we have no relations with the FBL because it has violated the agreements of the IEC. Despite the fact that the only condition we set for resolving the problem of the party's property was the return of an electric typewriter, they refused to hand it over.

We reject their conception that all of the party property that they stole from the headquarters was the personal property of the members of the FBL. They have lied when they declared that articles bought with the party's money were their personal property. Unfortunately, since they also removed the financial records, we cannot prove what they, as well as we, know.

We are willing to establish relations with them once they comply with what was agreed to in the IEC with respect to the property of the LS.

For the Political Committee of the LS
Ricardo Hernandez

* * * * * * * *

Mexico, Federal District
May 14, 1976

Attachment to the Report of the IEC Commission

I would like to clarify that the Liga Socialista (FBL) is willing to, and seeks to, have relations with the Liga Socialista. We would like to do this not only to implement unification of the Trotskyist organizations in Mexico on a principled basis, but also in order to have discussion and common work.

I consider it absurd that these relations have been interrupted by the Liga Socialista, using a typewriter as the pretext.

For the Political Committee
of the Liga Socialista (FBL)
s/ Roberto Torres

Statement by Greco and Riel

Mexico, May 14, 1976

As can be inferred from the report of the Commission, as well as from the declaration of the Political Committee of the LS, the organizational question that is paralyzing the process of discussion to resolve the political differences between the LS and the LS (FBL) and that has caused a de facto break in relations between the two organizations, is the refusal of the LS (FBL) to return all of the material removed by the LS (FBL) from the headquarters of the LS on January 1, 1976.

Our personal opinion on this is the following:

1. The argument raised by the comrades of the LS (FBL) that all the property taken from the LS headquarters, with the exception of the party archives, is personal property is absolutely unacceptable. We cannot conceive that in our International there existed an organization in which virtually all the equipment of the party apparatus is individual property and not the property of the organization.

The fact that these materials were supposedly acquired with the money of individuals of the organization cannot be interpreted to mean that these individuals are free to take back from the organization the materials in question whenever they please, especially when they are in a minority.

Obviously, in small sections, the first accumulation of materials by the party apparatus is achieved to a great extent by special contributions by the founders and leaders. But this does not justify using an individualistic rather than party criterion in order to treat such materials as personal rather than party property.

2. Thus we characterize the refusal of the LS (FBL) to return the electric typewriter demanded by the LS as an attitude that calls into question whether the LS (FBL) is acting in good faith in regard to the fusion process referred to in the statement of the International Executive Committee, which was signed by the LS (FBL). We also see this refusal as a clear violation of the agreements established in that statement.

3. This attitude contrasts with the attitude of the leadership of the LS in its model functioning on the Commission, trying to remove obstacles in the way of unification. This attitude is shown, among other ways, by the public statement concerning physical attacks (attached), by limiting their claim for the return of the materials that were removed to the electric typewriter, and by the proposal of Comrade Ricardo to solve the problem raised by the nonpublication in Intercontinental Press of his article in reply to Comrade Hansen through publication of this article in the IIDB.

We can only call on the comrades of the LS (FBL) to reconsider their position on this secondary question. Their stand goes against the constructive proposals that they have made -- among other things - the publication of an Internal Bulletin for joint discussion by the three organizations.

s/Greco
s/ Riel

* * * * * *

Statement by Stateman

It is false to assert that the major obstacle to improved relations between the faction of the Liga Socialista led by Comrade Ricardo and the Bolshevik Leninist Faction of the Liga Socialista resides in the question of the typewriter.

In the first place, when the words "except for personal property" were inserted in the IEC motion by the commission which drew it up, this was done with the knowledge that the comrades of the LS (FBL) considered the typewriter as personal property. Among other ways this was known to the members of the IEC was from the article by Joseph Hansen about the December 1975 convention of the Liga Socialista printed in Intercontinental Press before the IEC. The article itself was widely discussed at the IEC and was referred to in the IEC motion. Thus the IEC motion -- a compromise on all sides -- was adopted with the knowledge that the LS (FBL) considered the typewriter and other materials to be personal property which was not to be turned over to the LS.

More important, the major obstacles standing in the way of improved relations between the faction of the LS headed by Comrade Ricardo and the LS (FBL) are to be found elsewhere. The first is the methods of the Ricardo group before and during the December 1975 convention of the Liga Socialista, including but not limited to a political purge of the membership, breaking into a comrade's home to steal items contained therein, etc., which transformed the Liga Socialista into one of the most undemocratic organizations in the history of the Fourth International.

The same thug methods were continued by the Ricardo clique following the convention, as has been shown by the record of the physical attacks conducted by this group against members of the LS (FBL).

The second obstacle is political. After the December 1975 convention, the LS embarked on a course of capitulation to the Stalinists in the election campaign. This constitutes a challenge to a fundamental point of the Trotskyist program.

s/Stateman
May 14, 1976

* * * * * * *

COPY COPY COPY

A PHYSICAL ASSAULT ON THE MEMBERS OF THE FBL

(The following article appeared in the February 1-15 issue of El Socialista, newspaper of the Liga Socialista-Fraccion Bolchevique Leninista (Socialist League-Bolshevik Leninist Faction). The translation is by Intercontinental Press.)

On the evening of January 23 a number of comrades selling El Socialista (FBL) were physically attacked by members of the Tendencia Militante (Militant Tendency). (As we have explained, the Liga Socialista is divided into two public factions -- a majority grouping, the Tendencia Militante (TM); and a minority, the Fraccion Bolchevique Leninista (FBL). The name of the newspaper of both factions is El Socialista, a fact that has been seized on by the TM as an excuse for threatening the FBL in an effort to halt the sale of its paper.)

The events took place in Mexico City in front of the Salon Riviera, where the Mexican Communist party (PCM), Movement for Socialist Organization (MOS), and Tendencia Militante of the Liga Socialista were holding a "united meeting of the left" as part of the campaign of Valentin Campa (of the PCM) as candidate for the presidency of the republic.

In front of the two entrances to the hall, five members of the FBL were selling the issue of El Socialista in which the FBL puts forward its position on the Campa campaign.

At one of the entrances at 7:00 p. m., a member of the TM (whom we shall call "E") tried to take the newspapers away from Companeros Cadenas and Hoyos. The two companeros declined to be drawn into a violent confrontation but at the same time insisted on their right to sell their newspaper. In front of a number of members of the TM, "E" began to rough up Hoyos, threatening to "beat him up".

"L" backed up "E" but did not physically assault the members of the FBL. Instead, he simply demanded that they not sell their newspaper there and not "try to cause a provocation" (!). This prompted a discussion, which for the moment halted the pushing and shoving of Hoyos and Cadenas.

At the other entrance to the hall, "S" (of the TM) struck Israel from behind while the latter was selling El Socialista. But other members of the TM pulled "S" aside, and the selling of the newspaper continued until the meeting began inside the hall.

Thos e who spoke at the meeting were Roberto Jaramillo of the MOS, Ricardo Hernandez for the TM of the Liga Socialista, and Valentin Campa for the PCM. When Hernandez took the floor he began with a "denunciation" of the FBL for selling El Socialista. He merely alluded to his differences with the position put forward in the newspaper, stating that the Liga Socialista (TM) had been subjected to certain criticisms for having signed a joint platform with the MOS and PCM. According to Hernandez, the masses don't "give a flying shit" about the programmatic differences between the Trotskyists and the Mexican CP.

The aim of this article, however, is not to explain our areas of disagreement or agreement with the MOS, PCM, and TM, but to report the facts of the assault.

As the meeting was ending and a few persons began to file out the doors, sales of El Socialista began again; however, "G" organized a group of TM members to resume the attacks.

The intention of this group was to carry out a threat by "N", who had said that if the members of the FBL did not stop selling their newspapers, "more drastic measures would be taken" against them.

When this group of TM supporters entered the fray, Israel had to protect his papers with his body to avoid having them wrenched away; he was pushed and shoved from one side to the other.

"S", in a new act of provocation, grabbed another companero by the neck. The latter had to twist away to avoid being kneed in the face.

Despite these repeated efforts, however, it proved impossible to seize the newspapers from the companeros, who eventually left the area. Plain-clothes police officers who had the meeting under surveillance from their automobiles came into the scene to try to stir up a general brawl -- something that would have suited them perfectly.

* * * * *

Otra Vez los Mismos Métodos

Siguen las Agresiones de la TM

Por Pedro José

El pasado jueves 19 de febrero, entre las 17 y las 18 horas, fueron agredidos algunos camaradas por miembros de la Tendencia Militante (TM) de la Liga Socialista.

Esto sucedió en la Facultad de Ciencias Políticas y Sociales (FCPS) en Ciudad Universitaria de la Ciudad de México.

Cuando una brigada de la FBL estaba vendiendo Clave y pegando carteles de propaganda para nuestro periódico, llegaron varios miembros de la TM de la FCPS, entre ellos "N" y "S".

"N" que es el dirigente de la TM en la Universidad, azuzó a "S" que se caracteriza por su habilidad como golpeador, a que arrancara los carteles de Clave.

"S", desde luego, obedeció y comenzó a arrancar los carteles. Un compañero de la FBL, José, cuestionó a "S". La respuesta del golpeador fue la única posible: arremeter a empujones contra José.

No es la primera vez que los compañeros de la Tendencia Militante recurren a esta práctica nada política.

Anteriormente han arremetido a golpes y empujones contra brigadas de la Fracción Bolchevique-Leninista de la Liga Socialista.

Los argumentos que daban antes para justificar su actitud, eran que "deberíamos cambiar el nombre del periódico (El Socialista) e identificarnos como una fracción.

De ninguna manera se justifican sus argumentos y acciones.

Nosotros mismos vimos la necesidad de cambiar nombre a nuestro periódico para evidar que nos confundan con una publicación que sostiene que el PCM es revolucionario. Tampoco queriamos ser confundidos con una organización que avala un programa de colaboración entre patrones y trabajadores.

Ahora resulta que ya que cambiamos el nombre de nuestro periódico y que reiteramos que somos una fracción publica de la Liga Socialista, de cualquier manera la Tendencia Militante sigue actuando en una forma por demás reprobable.

Esto demuestra que su interes no era el nombre de El Socialista ni la tradición de una organización "pequeñoburguesa", sino atacar a los miembros de la FBL. Esto como todos sus actos anteriores, por erróneos se les revierten.

El caso más grave de agresión que se ha sufrido hasta ahora es el siguiente:

Durante el supuesto paro de actividades que se realizó en la Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México (UNAM) el 23 de febrero, la Liga Socialista FBL tenía la tarea de cuidar las puertas de acceso a la Universidad que se encuentran en Copilco.

En este lugar, como a las 11.40 horas, llegó up grupo de compañeros de la TM adonde estaban las guardias de la FBL. Los miembros de la TM empezaron a provocar a las guardias y a agredirlos verbalmente.

Pero la dinámica de un pensamiento que dista bastante de lo político no podía detenerse ahí. "S" empezó a insultar al compañero Ruperto, de la FBL. Lo trató de ratero y lo acusó de robarse unos relojes.

Ruperto no le contestó y empezó a caminar hacia donde estaban sus compañeros.

En ese momento llegó un autobus del cual empezaron a bajar números estudiantes. Ruperto comenzó a repartir volantes en los que se invitaba a la manifestación electricista del 28 de febrero, impresos por la Tendencia Democrática.

Cuando Ruperto estaba repartiendo los volantes "S" lo atacó, agarrándole la mano donde tenía los volantes. Ruperto se detuvó e inmediatamente sintió un fuerte golpe en plena cara que le lastimó el ojo izquierdo.

Al ver esto, varios compañeros de la FBL se acercaron a Ruperto. Los miembros de la TM consideraron que el episodio habia sido muy comico y lo festejaron con risas.

Para nosotros esto es muy grave, puesto que no se trata solamente de una agresión a un grupo de izquierda y que pertenecea la misma organización internacional que la TM. En este caso los miembros de la TM agredieron tambien a una guardia de la huelga.

Agredir a quienes están cuidando una barricada es algo que solo se puede esperar de provocadores o "porros". Quien sin ser esto recurren a estos métodos, deben ser mantenidos bajo estricta vigilancia y disciplina de sus organizaciones, pues objetivamente estan jugando el mismo papel que los "porros" a los provocadores.

Al poco tiempo de sucedido lo anterior llegaron los verdaderos "porros" a tratar de romper la barricada. Usaron métodos menos violentos que los de la TM. ¿Quien puede diferenciar entre los "porros" y los golpeadores de la TM?

En su versión de El Socialista, en el número 35, aparece un artículo titulado "La política del atraco". Entre otras cosas, el artículo carece de posiciones políticas y está lleno de frases de berrinche y "enojo".

Allí se menciona algo que refleja la incapacidad de su dirección. Dicen: "Este acto ha causado gran indignación entre nuestro militantes, alguno de ellos han sacado conclusiones violentas, las cuales estamos tratando de frenar".

Pero lo que no mencionan es que quienes han sacado esas "conclusiones" son algunos miembros de la dirección de la TM, que son quienes han azuzado o solapado a la base que los lleva a la práctica.

La otra posibildad, desde luego, es que la TM sea una organización con una militancia tan laxa que permita que sus miembros hagan lo que quieran, incluso cuando supuestamente están rompiendo las directrices de su partido.

Efectivamente, la práctica y las posiciones políticas ya nos están diferenciando. Esperemos que cada vez más, con mayor claridad, los activistas, grupos políticos, sindicales, etc., se den cuenta de que por que no pudimos convivir en una organización con quienes utilizan métodos del estalinismo.

(Clave number 39, March 1-15, 1976.)

* * * * *

Un Ataque mas de la TM

Agresión Contra la Liga Socialista (FBL)

El sábado 13, aproximadamente a las 12:00 hrs. en la Preparatoria Popular de Nonoalco, fueron agredidos dos miembros de la Fracción Bolchevique Leninista (FBL) de la Liga Socialista por un miembro del Comité Político de la Tendencia Militante (TM).

La causa de esta nueva agresión fue que los militantes de la FBL estaban vendiendo Clave a nombre de la FBL de la Liga Socialista. Esto hizo que el compañero "M. E." de la TM arremetiera a golpes contra los miembros de la FBL

Es la tercera vez que la TM recurre a la violencia física contra la FBL para sustituir la discusión política.

En otras ocasiones han dicho que se trata de acciones individuales de tal o cual companero, pero que la dirección "trata de evitarlo".

Ahora es claro que esto es un argumento mentiroso, a menos que ya ni siquiera puedan disciplinar a los miembros de su Comité Político.

Esto es más grave aún cuando el Comité Ejecutivo Internacional (CEI) de la Cuarta Internacional, a la cual pertenecen tanto la TM como la FBL acordó recientemente que las dos fracciones públicas de la LS y el Grupo Communista Internacionalista (GCI) debían establecer un curso tendiente a una unificación de principios.

En nuestra opinión, ésta era más que suficiente para que cuando menos se pararan los ataques físicos contra las brigadas de Clave y los miembros de la FBL.

Esto no ha sucedido, poniendo en jaque la validez de los acuerdos de nuestra dirección internacional: a nadie se le ocurrirá pedir que nos sentemos a discutir si es posible una unificación de principios con quienes agreden a nuestros militantes.

Además, en la Preparatoria Popular ha sido tradicional garantizar la irrestricta libertad de expresión para todos los grupos politicos. Los trotskistas hemos sido siempre los principales defensores de esta tradición.

Consideramos que desatar agresiones y pleitos dentro de la Preparatoria Popular sólo puede servir para que el Gobierno tenga argumentos para

reprimir a la escuela. Esta actitud sólo beneficia al enemigo de clase.

Con sus acciones, la TM pone en peligro mucho. Sus agresiones tienden a desatar un curso que, de seguirse puede tener como consecuencia una lucha física sin cuartel entre la izquierda.

La Fracción Bolchevique Leninista de la Liga Socialista y los compañeros que integran las brigadas de Clave están firmemente decididos a no hacer el juego a la provocación de la TM.

Para nosotros los intereses del movimiento están por encima de las rencillas entre grupos políticos. Para nosotros, el método para diferenciar a las distintas tendencias políticas es la discusión política pública. La violencia física utilizada por la TM es ajena a la clase obrera.

Creemos que ha llegado el momento en que el GCI y Rojo, que tambien son organizaciones simpatizantes de la Cuarta Internacional, dejen de permanecer callados ante esta situación. No hay más: deben definirse claramente en contra de los métodos utilizados por la TM en contra de la FBL de la Liga Socialista.

(Clave number 41, April 1-15, 1976)

* * * * *

HACIA LA SECCIÓN MEXICANA

DECLARACION DE LA CONFERENCIA DE UNIFICACION DEL GCI Y ROJO SOBRE LA CONSTRUCCION DE LA SECCION MEXICANA DE LA IV INTERNACIONAL.

LCI

La conferencia de unificación del GCI y ROJO, aunque formalmente no se encuentra incluída en la resolución sobre México del último CEI, está colocada enteramente bajo los auspicios de su espíritu unitario que promueve la pronta aparición de la Sección Mexicana de la IV Internacional.

La conferencia hace un llamado a la Liga Socialista y a su minoría escindida a que, lo más pronto posible, se ponga en práctica el conjunto de medidas que la Resolución del CEI propone. Por su parte, la organización reunificada que surge de esta Conferencia se compromete solemnemente a tener siempre en la agenda del día de su actividad, el punto de la unificación con la Liga Socialista, como una de sus preocupaciones y tareas prioritarias.

La organización reunificada considera que los obstáculos para la unificación de las fuerzas de la IV Internacional en México son cada vez menores, y que no falta hoy más que el esfuerzo conciente y continuado de todos sus militantes para llevar a buen término dicho objetivo.

La coyuntura internacional y nacional promueven también dicha unificación. Al nivel nacional, el polo que la IV Internacional representa, aparece ante cientos y miles de revolucionarios como el más attractivo, después del fracaso castrista, maoísta y stalinista. Incluso en las filas del PCM, en donde la acción audaz de nuestros camaradas de la LS ha hecho pesar más directamente la presencia trotskista dentro de ellos (debido a la Coalicion que han hecho con este partido), se observa cada vez mayor interés por las alternativas marxistas revolucionarias.

La organización reunificada que surge de esta conferencia considera que los puntos aprobados unánimemente por el último CEI, son realistas, responsables y posibles de cumplir.

Considera que la responsibilidad que esta resolución hace pesar sobre los hombros de los cuartistas en México, es muy grande. Sabemos lo que ello implica en la práctica: redoblar los esfuerzos organizativos y plantear más claramente nuestras tácticas y estrategias para el polo que podamos construir alternativo de la izquierda revolucionaria en México.

(Bandera Rojo, May 1976, number 37 (number 1 after unification.)

* * * *

COPY COPY COPY

TRANSLATION OF THE
STATEMENT OF THE LS

At the request of the group that recently split from our organization, the Political Committee of the Socialist League makes the following statement:

Following the split of the Socialist League, there have been various physical incidents between the groups resulting from the split. The leadership of the Socialist League (sympathizing section of the Fourth International) declares:

1. That we disapprove of all acts of violence within the workers movement and, above all, within the Trotskyist movement.

2. That we commit ourselves to preventing any repetition of these acts.

3. The fact that the Bolshevik Leninist Faction uses the name of the Socialist League and of our newspaper does not justify the use of violence.

4. That it is our duty to investigate those incidents and call to order those on our side responsible for any act of aggression.

5. We call on the ranks of the Socialist League not to initiate violence under any circumstances.

6. We promise to make this statement public.

(El Socialista number 41, April 1-15, 1976.)

Attachment B.

Motion on Portugal by Aubin:

1. The United Secretariat notes with satisfaction that the LCI and the PRT are jointly presenting a candidate in the Portuguese presidential elections on the basis of a political platform responding to the essential elements of a revolutionary Marxist program.

2. The U. S. will deploy all necessary efforts to extend this common activity and orientation within the perspective of the fusion of the LCI and the PRT into a Portuguese section of the Fourth International, in conformity with the intentions of the two organizations as publicly expressed in their common political document.

3. In such a favorable context for Trotskyism in Portugal, the U. S. has learned, through ICP, of the existence of a "new Portuguese Trotskyist group": the Socialist Action Group. According to the available information, the majority of this local group of about fifteen members is composed of former militants expelled from the PRT. The U. S. recalls that apart from the present sympathizing organization, the LCI, or the future unified organization that would become the official section at the next World Congress, no group or militant can claim to belong to the Fourth International.

4. Conscious that the unification process now under way between the LCI and the PRT ought to exclude no revolutionary militants who claim allegiance to Trotskyism and the Fourth International;

a) The U. S. would consider it positive, in the context of this process established by a common agreement between the LCI and the PRT, for the comrades of the PRT to reconsider with all necessary attention their decision concerning these militants expelled from the PRT; the U. S. stresses that nothing can justify the exclusion of Trotskyist militants from the construction of the Portuguese section of the Fourth International.

b) The U. S. addresses itself to the comrades of the LCI so that they may contribute to the solution of this question by favorably considering, if necessary, the request for adhesion of militants who would declare themselves in agreement with the program of the Fourth International and would be prepared to submit to the discipline of its national organization and to contribute to the construction of a section of the Fourth International in Portugal.

Attachment C.

Motion on Portugal by Galois:

1. A group of former members of the Portuguese PRT has formed a new organization in Portugal that states its support for Trotskyism and the Fourth International and that has supported the election campaign of the LCI. The United Secretariat therefore:

a) urges the LCI to approach the new organization to explore the possibility of unification on a principled basis.

b) urges the newly-formed group to seek unification with the LCI on a principled basis.

2. The United Secretariat instructs the USB to write to the PRT asking for full information on the January, 1976 expulsions.

* * * *

Attachment D.

Motion on Spain by Duret:

1. In view of the rapid developments of the political situation in Spain, the United Secretariat reaffirms the importance of the unification of the sympathizing organizations of the Fourth International (LCR/ETA-VI and LC), a unification which, in accordance with the decisions of the World Congress, would immediately give rise to the section of the Fourth International in the Spanish state.

2. It is in this framework that solutions must be sought to the organizational problems that may be posed, both between the two sympathizing organizations and within each of them. The United Secretariat reaffirms its absolute opposition to the creation of a new organization that would claim adherence to the Fourth International. It stresses that such an organization could in no case be recognized by the International, nor could it claim to undertake relations with the International or its sections. The reaffirmation of this position is made necessary by the recent expulsions that have occurred in the LC, which have not been justified before the U. S., and by the fact that these expelled militants have addressed themselves to the U. S. on the subject of these expulsions.

3. Hence, in order to prevent any possibility of the de facto emergence of a third public group and

In order that the solution to this problem introduce no obstacle in the process of fusion between the LCR/ETA-VI and the LC, the U. S. mandates a delegation of three comrades to draw up modalities that permit the maintenance of these militants within the Fourth International to be assured.

Indeed, the International cannot permit itself to remove from its ranks a single revolutionary militant claiming allegiance to Trotskyism and the Fourth International and prepared to submit to the discipline of the International and its national organization.

Given the imperatives deriving from the political situation and the repeated absence of the comrades of the LC from its meetings, the U. S. mandates the delegation to discuss with the leadership of the LC, the "revolutionary socialist" tendency, and the LCR/ETA-VI in order to make a decision on this case within the next two weeks.

* * * * *

Attachment E.

Motion on Spain by Galois:

The United Secretariat established a commission composed of Atwood, Julio, and a third comrade to be designated by the Bureau, to gather information on the internal problems that have arisen in Spain and to report back to the next United Secretariat meeting.

* * * * *

Attachment F.

Letter from Joseph Hansen concerning Hernandez article.

COPY COPY COPY

May 20, 1976

United Secretariat

Dear Comrades,

I am writing you concerning the article "Reply to an Essay on Sectarianism" by Comrade Ricardo Hernández, which, as you know, he has asked us to publish in Intercontinental Press as a reply to the article "Is the Mexican CP No Longer a Stalinist Organization?" The latter document was translated from the February 1-15 issue of El Socialista (FBL) and carried in the March 1 issue of Intercontinental Press.

The first paragraph of Comrade Hernández's reply ought to be recast, in my opinion, so as to eliminate the inaccurate reference to the sponsorship of Intercontinental Press as well as the "robbery" allegations. I hope that Comrade Hernández will agree to this.

However, I would like to call your attention to something of a more serious nature. Aside from incidental debating points, which Comrade Hernandez is, of course, entitled to make, the central thesis of his argumentation runs as follows:

A revolutionary program is correct on the historic level, but "conjuncturally" it is of little use.

From this he draws the conclusion that either ultraleftists or reformists can be more revolutionary at a given moment than Trotskyists who adhere to the program of revolutionary Marxism. In fact he maintains that Trotskyists of that kind are not revolutionists but sectarians.

Going still further, he maintains that although the Mexican Communist party betrayed the working class in the past, and most likely will do so again in the future, right now--in contradiction to Moscow's line--it is advancing a revolutionary platform. Hence he concludes that the electoral platform of the Mexican Stalinists must be upheld and advanced, and presented to the workers as the most important political development in Mexico today.

On the theoretical level, this thesis constitutes an example of empirical reasoning of the most vulgar kind. A discussion on this could have educational value.

Of more immediate concern to the Trotskyist movement as a whole is the fact that Comrade Hernández's thesis stands in direct opposition to the main proposition on which the Fourth International was founded; that is, the absolute necessity of adhering to and applying the program of Marxism-Leninism against both opportunists and ultraleftists in all the activities of the revolutionary party.

In support of his position, Comrade Hernández advances arguments concerning the nature of Stalinism (at least in Mexico) and the characteristics of populat frontism that can seriously miseducate militants if they remain unanswered. The same goes for his identification of engagement in the class struggle with involvement in an electoral campaign, in this case the electoral campaign of a small, discredited Stalinist group that is seeking to refurbish its leftist image.

It seems to me that it is the duty of the United Secretariat to take a stand on Comrade Hernández's position with regard to the presidential elections in Mexico. A statement should be issued, explaining, particularly to the ranks of the Fourth International, wherein he is wrong.

I should add that in my opinion closer attention should be paid to the meaning and possible consequences of Comrade Hernández's course.

To my knowledge, he has up to now given no account to any responsible body of the Fourth International of his negotiations with the leaders of the Mexican Communist party. How were the conversations initiated? What occurred in the sessions? What commitments were made by both sides? Why the strange reticence about reporting what went on? Isn't the leadership of the Fourth International entitled to know the facts? Doesn't Comrade Hernández's silence about this play into the hands of the Stalinists and make it more difficult to expose them?

Comrade Hernández's course of portraying the platform of the Stalinists as revolutionary and his deep engagement in championing their electoral campaign can have very detrimental con sequences. His political line inevitably fosters a mood in at least part of the ranks of the Liga Socialista to capitulate to the Mexican Communist party.

In addition, Comrade Hernández is clearly proceeding in defiance of the position taken by both the Grupo Communista Internacionalista and the Fraccion Bolchevique Leninista against supporting the electoral platform of the Mexican Stalinists. That position was incorporated in the unification agreement under the formula of engaging in a "common effort" to "start immediate common activity in all fields of work ... including a common electoral campaign of all those concerned, in the presidential elections of Mexico." Comrade Hernández's course jeopardizes the unification process, for a principled unification would be impossible in face of opposing positions and lines of action on such a fundamental question as supporting a Stalinist electoral platform.

All this speaks for political intervention on the part of the United Secretariat, that is, a statement of opinion that could have a salutary effect among those who may have been misled by Comrade Hernández's central thesis.

To defer criticizing Comrade Hernández's rupture with one of the basic principles of our movement would constitute a bad mistake, in my opinion. The elections will be held July 4. The criticism, to be effective, should be made at once; in fact, it should have already been made.

To postpone action until after July 4, that is, until after the elections are over, would open the United Secretariat to charges of evasion of a clear political responsibility that would be hard to answer.

Comradely yours,
s/Joseph Hansen

* * * * *

Attachment G.

Motion on Mexico by Jones:

The bureau of the United Secretariat will send a letter to Comrade Ricardo concerning points and formulations on the CP and other issues raised in his article. It will take a position on publication of this article after a clarification of Comrade Ricardo's views and those of the LS at the next United Secretariat.

* * * * *

Motion on Mexico by Galois:

The United Secretariat decides to recommend immediate publication of the article by Comrade Ricardo in either public or internal format. The United Secretariat will issue a short statement of disassociation from the position on the Mexican Communist Party taken in Comrade Ricardo's article, to be published in the same format (public or internal) as the article.

* * * * *

Attachment H.

Motion on Mexico by Georges:

The United Secretariat of 23 May, 1976, has received a request from Comrade Hansen to condemn an article by a comrade of the LS (Mexico). Inasmuch as the accused article does not, in the view of the United Secretariat, constitute a programmatic break with the bases of the Fourth International, the United Secretariat considers it unjustified to take an official position in this regard. In refusing to do this, the U. S. does not intend to affirm its agreement with all the assertions of this article.

* * * * *

Attachment I.

Motion on India by Claudio:

The United Secretariat decides:

a) To write to the leadership of the Indian section asking them whether measures have been taken against Comrade K.

b) to demand, if no measure has been adopted up to now, that the position of Comrade K, whose attitude is of such a character as to discredit the Fourth International in the country, be examined immediately;

c) to write an official letter to Comrade K. asking him to explain his position and informing him that in any event the United Secretariat will make a public statement during its next meeting.

* * * * *

Motion on India by Galois:

To write the Indian section for information on the decisions taken at its recent national conference, in particular for information on what decisions have been taken regarding the public positions taken by Kailas Chandra, which are in violation of Marxist principles. To place this point on the agenda of the next United Secretariat meeting.

* * * * *

Attachment J.

Motion on Organization of Pre-World-Congress Discussion:

The following procedures are established for the pre-world-congress discussion bulletin:

1. In general, material submitted for publication in the IIDB shall be published in chronological order as speedily as is technically possible.

2. A parity commission shall be established to work out procedures for division of space in the IIDB. The initial guidelines shall be established in the next several days. The parity commission shall review the situation at least every three months.

3. The parity commission shall be composed of two members of each international tendency, as defined by written platforms.

* * * * * *

Attachment K.

COPY COPY COPY

Paris, April 8, 1976

From: Secretariat of the PB of the LCR

To: Bureau of the United Secretariat

Dear Comrades,

We have just received the minutes of the IEC ("Minutes of the IEC --Feb. 12-15, 1976"). To our great surprise, on page 15, the votes of Comrade Nemo are registered in the same way as those of other members of the IEC who are members of the French section. However, Comrade Nemo did not take part in the work of the IEC except in the capacity of translator, and was not coopted as a member of the IEC until the end of the meeting. Moreover, he is not listed--correctly so--on the first page of the "minutes" among the members of the IEC, nor among the invited guests.

We therefore ask that the "minutes" be corrected on this specific point, and that the correction be accompanied by the attached resolution of our Central Committee concerning the cooption of Comrade Nemo to the IEC.

Fraternally,
For the Secretariat of the PB,
s/ Alain

* * * * *

MOTION ON THE ELECTION OF COMRADE NEMO TO THE IEC ADOPTED BY THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE LCR

The Central Committee of the LCR (French section of the Fourth International), meeting April 3 and 4, 1976,

--after hearing the report on the proceedings of the Plenum of the IEC of February 15 and 16, 1976,

--after discussing, in particular, the cooptation of Comrade NEMO, member of the Central Committee of the LCR, at the Plenum of the IEC,

objects to the method used in this cooptation, which is contrary to the letter and the spirit that should more and more predominate in the building of an international leadership representative of the

different currents that arise in the discussions preparatory to the World Congresses and reflecting the real work of the different sections, through the comrades best suited to systematize it at the international level;

protests against the fact that the Central Committee of which Comrade Nemo is a member -- was not even consulted prior to this cooptation, either by Comrade Nemo, who must have known about the proposal, or by the members of the United Secretariat, leaders of the international minority faction to which Comrade Nemo is now connected.

The Central Committee brings this resolution to the attention of the United Secretariat for communication to the members of the IEC and to the members of the sections and sympathizing organizations of the Fourth International.

* * * * *

STATEMENT BY NEMO

In order to avoid any misunderstandings I must state the following points concerning my election to the IEC (on the recommendation of the LTF, in replacement of a Canadian comrade):

1. Although all the members of the IEC are elected as individuals, it would have been in fact more correct for the CC of the LCR to have been informed and consulted on this proposal submitted to a vote of the IEC by the LTF. This was not possible because of circumstances: this proposal was not collectively discussed and decided on until after the February CC meeting, at the international meeting of the LTF that was held just before the IEC. (At the CC, I announced to members of the United Secretariat and of the Political Bureau that I was participating in that meeting of the LTF. Once it was decided upon, the LTF proposal was made known to the members of the U. S. at the meeting held on the eve of the IEC, and to central leaders of the French section.) Nevertheless, I strongly regret that the delayed character of the LTF proposal -- due to the fact that it could not in any way be separated from the whole discussion in the LTF which the recent developments in the situation in the International brought about -- did not allow the question to be examined beforehand by the French CC. Moreover, it remains true that since the LTF proposal was directly tied to the question of its political expression as a minority current in the bodies of the International, the French section could only have had a consultative role in this case.

2. In regard to the statutary aspect which the French CC motion refers to, the following remarks must be made. In general, the members of the IEC are elected by the World Congress, but it is normal to "replace" those among them who cannot exercise their mandate any longer. On this, the only explicit provision in the statutes currently in effect is the following: "A national section can propose replacement of a member representing it; however, this must be ratified by a majority of the International Executive Committee." Thus it is quite true that "the letter of the statutes" does not envision the possibility of the replacement of a member leaving the IEC by a member of another national section. This provision calls for a few interpretive remarks, however:

--First, while it recognizes for the national sections the right to propose a replacement, it is indeed the IEC itself which it recognizes as having the power in such a case to make the final decision;

--Second, while the statutes do not envision it, they do not explicitly exclude either the hypothesis of other forms of replacement decided on the responsibility of the IEC;

--Last, and this is what is essential, this unique provision in the statues does not in fact clearly define the procedure to be followed except in a very specific hypothetical case: the case where the composition of the IEC has been arrived at from the beginning primarily with reference to "representation" of the national sections. But this has not exactly been the case since the last World Congress: the members of the IEC were elected according to the proposals of the political currents existing throughout the International. All the "replacements" that have been made since then have followed this same procedure. The political situation in the International also justifies the fact that some comrades were elected in this way to the IEC, according to their international political orientation, who could be in a minority position in their own national section based on this same political orientation.

It is obvious enough that in a situation such as that opened up by the last World Congress, the problem of replacements is posed in terms that are only very partially clarified by the present letter of the statutes. For example: what should be done if, between two Congresses, the political boundaries of the currents change quite considerably? How can a possible criterion of national affiliation be reconciled with the proposal of candidacies by tendencies and with the expresion of minorities in the different sections?...

On such problems, it would be very useful if the next World Congress, which should be discussing norms of democratic functioning of the International, could specify the conditions for "replacement" on the IEC in the case of an international discussion structured into ongoing currents. In the recent period, the insufficiencies of the statutes have, however, forced the IEC to take responsibility for the necessary interpretation of a provision corresponding imperfectly to the present situation. Thus, beginning with the 1975 IEC, it had to proceed with the "replacement" of certain members of the IEC; it will be noted that in three of the cases concerned, it was done by the comrades of the same political current as the "replaced one" but belonging to a different national section. (Two of these cases concerned, moreover, the IMT: Comrade Martine of the Belgian section, replacing a deceased Palestinian comrade; Comrade Anna, belonged then, to my knowledge, to the Swiss section, replacing a French comrade.) It would thus be completely unjustified to let it be thought that my personal case is an isolated case or that it would itself be of a character to create a precedent harmful to the letter of the statutes. The truth is that it was the IEC, at its 1975 meeting, which in fact allowed a special interpretation of the statutes to prevail (the minutes of this meeting take note of no objection to the lack of correspondence between the national affiliation of certain "replaced persons" and their "replacements"). It is up to the next World Congress to determine for the future whether this interpretation is legitimate or not. As for the 1976 IEC, it felt obliged to hold to the same interpretation as before concerning the two new cases -- including mine -- that raised this same question of national affiliation.

Last, this "spirit that should predominate in the shaping of an international leadership" which the French CC motion talks about, should not ignore, among other principles, the following consideration: as much as possible, it is a vital requirement for the International in a situation where it contains animated political differences, to avoid any disjunction between bodies of the International and leaderships of tendencies or factions. That means in particular that it could only be highly prejudicial to the unity of the International if comrades responsible for leading one or another current (whether majority or minority) were not clearly accountable for their political positions before the bodies at a corresponding level of the International.

It is such an understanding that seems to have led such an international leader of the IMT as Comrade Mandel, to vote for my election at the last IEC. It is in any case this concept of political clarity and responsibility that caused the LTF to make the proposal concerning me: thus, it was deemed that the position which I assume, as a member of the LTF, in the discussion in the French section, made it necessary that I be associated completely with the central tasks of the LTF; as a consequence, it appeared equally necessary that I take on political responsibility not only before the CC of the LCR but also before the bodies of the International.

Nemo
April 10, 1976

Addressed to the PB of the LCR for the publication in the Internal Bulletin containing the minutes of the April CC. Copy to the U. S. for communication to the members of the IEC and leaderships of sections and sympathizing organizations.

* * * * *

Attachment L

Statement by Julio

Considering the development of the U. S. meeting of 22-23 May, 1976, I hold that it is necessary to make the following statement:

I am in agreement with the criterion that tendencies can be recognized only on the basis of written platforms, and this is what we are trying to concretize. But the comrades must take much account of the fact that the majority of adherents of our current, as outlined in our declaration to the last IEC, belong to organizations of among the fewest resources within the International, that they are subject to tough repression that is extremely onerous. I therefore consider that the measures required to organize the pre-World-Congress discussion must take account of this concrete situation. I further consider:

That the voting of motions such as the ones on Spain and Portugal can, in my opinion, initiate genuine processes of unification, on principled bases, of organizations or groups that form active parts of the Fourth International at this time, processes that we agree to stimulate in order to arrive at unified organizations -- that is, the official sections that are required by the political situation and which, obviously, should not be impeded by the necessary political discussions.

That, therefore, I must make clear my position that in the event that unity in Portugal cannot be concretized, at the next world congress there will be no alternative but to also recognize as a sympathizing organization the PRT, which has contributed and is contributing as much as the LCI to the construction of the revolutionary party in Portugal. No other position could be supported by an Argentine of the PST who saw four sympathizing organizations recognized in his country in spite of the fact that these organizations had not followed the same trajectory as the Portuguese PRT.

That, in view of these considerations, I am in favor of the PRT reconsidering the expulsions that have taken place, as I expressed in the motion presented to the last IEC jointly with Capa and Romero.

That as regards the situation in Spain, I would like to recall that in the U. S. meeting of April there was a motion that the LCR/ETA-VI take an active attitude toward the trials that were going on within the LC, about which the U. S. Bureau had been sufficiently informed. This attitude was not adopted and therefore the de facto existence of a non-public group formed on the basis of support to political positions on which the Bureau of the U. S. was also adequately informed cannot be ignored. This is a fact created by the antidemocratic and arbitrary expulsion carried out in the midst of the LC's pre-congress discussion period. Thus, in my opinion there is no other possibility except to confer upon these comrades their status as members of the Fourth International. The motion adopted by a majority takes a threatening attitude toward comrades who have demonstrated their political responsibility and seriousness in face of the events.

That in spite of these disagreements with the wording of these motions, I only abstained on them, for I share the considerations on the necessity for the most rapid unifications possible. And I voted against the motions of the minority because these motions take account only of its factional interests, ignoring the new existing situation in the Fourth International as a whole.

* * * *

CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN JOSEPH HANSEN AND THE UNITED SECRETARIAT

(For May 20 letter from Hansen to United Secretariat, see Attachment F to the report, or, minutes of the May 22-23 U. Sec. meeting.)

COPY COPY COPY COPY COPY COPY

May 26, 1976

Dear Joe,

We received your communication regarding the article sent by the Liga Socialista leadership in reply to the criticism of their electoral policy published in Intercontinental Press. We are glad to note that you are seeking consultation prior to publishing articles on controversial matters. Our advice is not to publish this article until after clarification of some of the political issues it raises. We will discuss the electoral policy of the Mexican Trotskyists at the July United Secretariat meeting, on the basis of a full dossier and information from all the groups involved, and will then decide whether a statement of the USec on that electoral policy is necessary or not, and whether and where this particular article should be published.

We only regret that the correct procedure you applied this time with regard to the publication of the LS leadership's reply to IP was not used before in relation to the publication of the criticism of the LS's policies in IP. In our opinion, it was a mistake to publish that criticism. This was in clear opposition to the tradition we have followed for many years of not publicly criticizing tactical moves of sections or sympathizing organizations with which we disagree; on several occasions, we were confronted with much graver mistakes than those committed by the LS comrades. By applying a double standard--not consulting the associate editors and the USec in the case of the criticism of the LS, but only consulting them in the case of the LS's reply to your criticism--you have once again confronted us with an accomplished fact and thus risk preventing the readers of IP from reading both sides of a controversy. From both points of view the procedure initially followed was wrong. We only hope that it will not be repeated, and that from now on you will consult us on the publication of all material in IP that is likely to provoke conflicts inside our movement.

Fraternally yours,
s/ Walter, for the United Secretariat

* * * *

New York, N. Y.
June 14, 1976

United Secretariat

Dear Comrades,

This will acknowledge receipt of the letter dated May 26 signed by Walter in behalf of the United Secretariat.

I find this reply to my letter of May 20 rather surprising. In publishing articles in defense of the basic principles of Trotskyism or in publishing counterpositions such as the article submitted by Comrade Ricardo, I did not raise the question of protocol in relation to either the contributing (not "associate") editors or the United Secretariat. Yet this is the main theme of your reply of May 26.

Let me recapitulate my letter of May 20. As I indicated, I am in favor of publishing Comrade Ricardo's article with the exception of some allegations in the first paragraph that have nothing to do with the argumentation in the rest of the article. I was hopeful that you would be able to persuade Comrade Ricardo to make the indicated changes in that paragraph.

The chief purpose of my letter of May 20 was to draw your attention to Comrade Ricardo's departure from some of the basic principles of Trotskyism in both his article and in his public political course in Mexico. The majority of the United Secretariat seemed not to have noticed Comrade Ricardo's deviations, although a copy of his article was sent by him to you for your information, and his course was well publicized in the Mexican bourgeois press. In this instance, the reports in the bourgeois press were more accurate than usual, as can be judged by the material in El Socialista.

In view of the failure of the United Secretariat to take note of what was happening, I indicated the ways in which Comrade Ricardo was departing from Trotskyist principles, the main one being his support of the platform of the Mexican Communist party and his depicting that platform as revolutionary.

You say absolutely nothing about the questions I brought to your attention save the one

concerning supporting and peddling the Stalinist electoral platform, which you aver is only a tactical question that you will consider after the election is over. Meanwhile Comrade Ricardo has continued his public advocacy of that platform on the basis of commitments to the Mexican Stalinists that still remain unknown to the Trotskyist movement.

As to the little you do say about Comrade Ricardo's course and his shocking defense of it, I differ with both your position and your procedure.

1. Our movement has never regarded support to a Stalinist platform as a tactical matter. It is a political question involving basic principles. Political intervention was called for in the Mexican situation in the form, at the very minimum, of a public statement, inasmuch as the violation of principles had been carried on publicly since last January, to the damage of the Trotskyist movement internationally.

2. To defer taking a political position until after the election is over would, as I noted in my letter, "open the United Secretariat to charges of evasion of a clear political responsibility that would be hard to answer."

It is now hard to avoid the conclusion that the majority of the United Secretariat does hold that the programmatic line demarcating Trotskyism from Stalinism can be disregarded, or bent as one pleases, to facilitate wheeling and dealing in an electoral farce like the one in Mexico. Damage has already been done. Worse damage will result if the errors are not recognized and the proper balance sheet drawn, including criticism of the default in leadership committed by the majority of the United Secretariat through its failure to take a political stand on this question in a timely way.

Comradely yours,
s/Joseph Hansen

* * * * *

CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN GUS HOROWITZ AND MIKADO

COPY COPY COPY

May 15, 1976

Dear Comrade Gus,

This letter should have been written a long time ago, if only to keep up our contact, which has been somewhat sparse these last few months.

The political and organizational situation has changed considerably in the recent period: there is no need to go into the great mobilization of the Palestinian population against the Zionist regime on both sides of the pre-1967 borders. This is a phenomenon whose significance no one will miss, even though it remains obvious to us that these mobilizations are without any medium-term result, that is, as long as they are not part of a broader struggle of the Arab masses against the Zionist state or in the framework of a broad mobilization of the Jewish workers of Israel. The situation in the region has not, for the moment, led to a new outbreak of the revolutionary movement of the Arab masses, and in Israel itself the Jewish workers remain tragically passive in face of the crisis of the Zionist state.

Out of this mobilization of the Palestinian masses--inside Israel at least--and due to a substantial development of our organization and our intervention, we have been able to start to gain a real implantation among the Palestinian population. It is not an exaggeration to say that the LCR is at a turning point, and faces the possibility of gaining a real mass audience fairly soon, at least in the Palestinian population. This requires having a serious attitude and taking on responsibilities to a degree unprecedented in our history.

Already, during the Day of Land mobilizations, we played a not insignificant political role, not only in the Union of Arab Students, but in certain villages where our current is beginning to implant itself. The fact that at the time of the united demonstration of May 1, we were able to organize, with the comrades of the ISO, more than 250 militants, the great majority members and sympathizers of our organization, including many Arab workers and students, is an example of what the present development of the class struggle demands today of revolutionary Marxists.

This new situation is at the center of our discussion preceding the fourth congress of Matzpen Marxist, which was postponed until this summer. In advance, we take pleasure in inviting an observer from the SWP....

Some brief remarks on the latest developments in our international movement. Some of us were literally scandalized by Comrade Mary-Alice's report to the SWP National Committee on the IEC and the situation inside the International. No balance sheet on the disintegration of the LTF, its political significance and its deep causes, but on the contrary a report which tried to show that it was the IMT that had split! Equally bad is the fact that agreements adopted unanimously by the IEC, and in particular by members of the LTF, were presented as factional maneuvers made by the IMT. It seems obvious enough that the last IEC marked an important and positive step in the development of our movement and in the strengthening and centralization of the International, which would necessitate a more honest and more "constructive" report.

My personal opinion is that a certain decrystallization of the tendency debate is now possible and desirable, without, however, endangering the unity of the international. Such a decrystallization would make it possible to carry on a clear debate on different problems of strategy and tactics which the present "factional battle" makes difficult. But this is obviously only possible on the condition that the decisions made by majority rule by the leadership of the International be respected and that the structures of our movement be strengthened. A strengthening of democratic centralism at the international level would make possible today a whole series of political offensives toward various centrist currents, such as Lutte Ouvrière, Lotta Continua, the WSL, etc.

I have just read in the Militant that the Boston march was cancelled. The reasons are not very clear. If you could give me some details... The article by Dave Frankel on the USSR and the Jews was very good, and we are publishing it in the form of a pamphlet.

I hope to receive news from you as quickly as possible.

fraternal communist greetings,
s/Mikado

COPY COPY COPY

June 16, 1976

Dear Mikado:

Your letter of May 15 was forwarded to me. We were pleased to hear of the progress you have been making, and hope you will continue to keep us informed. Also we want to thank you for the invitation to your congress this summer. . . .

On Boston. The decision to call off the march in Boston was, of course, a tactical decision, not a question of principle, and it is very difficult to judge such developments from afar. I was in Europe at the time of the proposed march and don't know the exact situation very well either. But I think that the following points can be made.

The fact that the march had to be called off was a big setback to the Black struggle. The decision to call it off was a very hard decision to make, and it was made only after the most thorough evaluation of the situation. On the basis of this evaluation, it was the opinion of the march leadership that to have proceeded with the march would have led to an even greater setback. The circumstances were roughly the following.

a.) In the confrontation between the racists and the Black people, social forces of considerable weight were involved on the side of the racists. To mount an effective response to the racists required a broad, united campaign by the supporters of the Black struggle.

b.) The planned march was the correct type of response, but this march had a built-in weakness from the beginning. While the march had the formal endorsement of many Black organizations and progressive groups, few of them were actively involved in the actual work of organizing the demonstration. Many of these groups preferred to devote their energies to the electoral campaigns that are going on. Despite this, it was correct to proceed with the plans for the march, since it at least enjoyed the endorsement 'of a broad range of groups. It could not be expected that the march would be really massive under such circumstances, but it would have been a positive step forward, and would have helped to build bigger and broader united actions.

c.) At various times in Boston there had been very serious racist mobilizations, and racist violence was an ever present danger in this volatile situation. A large, broadly-based march could have stood up to this--both by making it politically difficult for the racists to attack the march, and by making it possible to organize effective self-defense. But in the days immediately preceding the march a sudden and qualitative turn for the worse occurred. Without going into the details of the incidents that led to this, suffice it to say that a near-hysterical climate had developed. It was clear that the racist forces felt themselves free to attack the march without fear of reprisal--in fact with the confidence that the police would look the other way, and that police provocateurs would play a role in helping them. In face of this, the leadership of the Black community felt completely on the defenseve, and was overwhelmingly in favor of calling off the march for fear of a massive, violent confrontation. We, along with a few allies, tried very hard to convince the broad range of groups that endorsed the march that with their endorsement and backing a broadly-based, march could still be successful, despite the difficulties. But we were not able to convince them. Nor were we and a few allies large enough and influential enough in the Black community to go ahead and assume the leadership of it all by ourselves. A march under such circumstances would have been too narrowly-based to have been successful. It would surely have been broken up by the racists--and this would have been a much more serious defeat for the Black community than calling off the march. Under such circumstances, the only correct course of action for revolutionaries with leadership responsibilities in the mass movement was to admit that a setback had occurred, that the march could not be held at that moment, and to launch an educational campaign to lay the basis for another march at the soonest possible date in the future.

d.) From a more general point of view, this was not a unique situation in the class struggle. When real social forces are involved, there are bound to be victories and setbacks. Optimism and audacity are indispensible qualities of revolutionary leadership, but there are also some situations in which it is necessary to retreat in order to prevent a major defeat and lay the basis for future audacious action. That is in essence what we faced in Boston. It was a hard decision to make, but a necessary one.

e.) The repercussions of all this still remain to be seen. The racists, of course, feel emboldened; but the Black community does not feel defeated. An educational campaign is underway to further expose the racists and the complicity of the liberals, and to explain the need for a mass mobilization. The original leadership of the march, including SWP comrades, remains highly respected in the Black community in Boston--coming out of this entire situation with the best chances of

organizing something new. Of course there are some groups -- not many that are based in Boston, very few Black groups -- that criticize the decision to call off the march. But most Black groups think that the correct decision was made; and even some major socialist groups or currents that have usually been hostile to us -- such as the Guardian -- think that the decision was correct.

On your remarks about the international debate after the IEC meeting. On one of your remarks I'm not completely sure of what you are referring to, because there may be a mixup due to the dates on the documents. You mention the report by Mary-Alice Waters to the SWP NC. This is contained in SWP IIB no. 2, 1976. But this report was presented to the SWP NC in January, 1976 prior to the most recent IEC meeting. Thus, it is referring to the 1975 IEC meeting. On the other hand, there is a written report (not given to an SWP NC meeting) on the recent IEC meeting of 1976 by Barry Sheppard, contained in SWP IIB no. 6, 1976.

Anyway, in one of your points you say that the unanimously-agreed-upon accords of the IEC were presented by Mary Alice as factional maneuvers of the IMT. From the context of your remarks, I assume you are talking about the unanimous agreement on the question of the IT made at the 1975 IEC meeting. We never presented that agreement as a factional maneuver of the IMT. On the contrary, we still think that agreement was correct. What we say is that the IMT has interpreted this agreement unjustifiably, giving it a different meaning than that contained in the actual text of the agreement (a meaning we would never have supported), and has then made a factional attack on us for not acting in accordance with the IMT's interpretation of the agreement. We, however, insist that the only correct procedure is to stick to the exact text of the agreement. (The agreement is unambiguous, and we did act accordingly.) Barry Sheppard's report in IIB no. 6 goes into this in some detail in light of the decisions of the recent IEC on this matter (which were not unanimous.)

As for drawing "a balance sheet of the disintegration of the LTF, its political significance and its profound causes," the reports of both Mary-Alice Waters and Barry Sheppard explain our essential views. The PST leadership and its allies left the LTF because of political differences that arose over Portugal and because they broke with the organizational norms that the LTF had been founded on. What had held the LTF together previously was agreement on the main political questions and organizational norms. Keep in mind that the PST leadership and the other comrades had voted for all LTF documents prior to the LTF resolution on Portugal presented at the recent IEC. But while the LTF has a clear position on Portugal, the PST leadership and its allies do not -- neither on what their own position is exactly, nor on what their precise criticisms of the LTF position are. So far they have not stated their position in writing. But this is their responsibility. In the absence of current documents, it is difficult to guess what they are thinking.

As for their break on organizational norms, this too is a question for the PST leadership and its allies to answer. The LTF has clear positions on what we think are the correct norms. When these norms were violated in Mexico, with the backing of PST leaders, the LTF condemned this, and expelled from the LTF the three comrades most directly responsible -- Greco and Eduardo of the PST and Ricardo of the LS (Tendencia Militante). (For the LTF position on this, see the minutes of the IEC in SWP IIB no. 6, 1976, pp. 29-30.)

So, what has happened involves no basic change in the political positions or organizational norms of the LTF. There is an essential continuity in the LTF position in these respects. The PST leadership and its allies have broken with this continuity. It is they, first of all, who must explain what their new positions are.

Incidentially, what is the IMT's evaluation of the split in the LTF? I have tried to explain it from the standpoint of expressed differences over political questions and organizational norms, that is, by raising the questions: "What are the political positions of the LTF, the IMT and of the PST leadership, and which of these positions is correct?" Do you have a different explanation?

I certainly agree with you that a decrystallization of the international debate is desirable, and we will do whatever we can to create a de-escalation of tensions. One thing that would certainly help create an atmosphere encouraging discussion would be the speedy translation and publication of documents. Unfortunately, several contributions have been rejected outright by the U. Sec. majority, others have been postponed for months on end (amounting to virtual rejection), and others have not been translated though they have been available for months (such as the LTF resolution on Portugal from the last IEC and several other items from long ago). This is a central concern to us.

Have you been following the progress of the SWP's legal suit against the FBI and other government agencies? This is a major development for us.

Hope to hear from you soon.

Regards,
s/Gus Horowitz

* * * * *